



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

AMERICAN ADVOCATE OF PEACE

VOL. LIV.
No. 5.

BOSTON, AUGUST, 1892.

PRICE, \$1.00
A YEAR.

PUBLISHED BY THE AMERICAN PEACE SOCIETY.

NO. 3 SOMERSET STREET, BOSTON, MASS.

TO J. G. W.

B. F. T.

Herald of life and truth;
Prophet of peace and love;
Strong as the eagle's youth;
Tender as voice of dove.

Trumpet blast comes no more;
Toil of the race is done;
Rest by the quiet shore,
Watch till the setting sun.

Light-beams from heaven's Sun
Break through the mists of death;
Comes to thee His "well done"
Sweet on the Zephyr's breath.

PEACE AND EXPEDIENCY.

BY KATE GANNETT WELLS.

Peace principles have always been hampered by the doctrine of expediency which has been applied to them. Their consistent advocates have been the Quakers and a few individuals here and there, scattered in various countries, and of varying modes of thought in other matters. But as a general rule the peace party, though a name is not always a voucher for the existence of a body of men, has been governed by expediency, and therefore has carried but little weight of influence or of character. It has had a difficult position to occupy and has found more friendliness shown to it when it has talked of arbitration as a method of preventing war than when it has talked of peace as a principle.

It has deprecated war in the abstract and justified particular wars. It always has considered the last war, wherever it may have occurred or for whatever cause, either as unavoidable or necessary, or perhaps righteous; one or the other pretext being alleged. Such temporizing hardly forms an available platform on which to kindle enthusiasm. Of course time slowly changes people's opinions, and many a war once considered right is now called wrong. But we wonder if Fourth of July and spread-eagle-winged patriotism will ever permit an historian to speak of the American Revolution and the American Civil War as two evils which patience, diplomacy and morality could have averted.

Such silent permission will never come until the national virtue of patriotism is merged in the larger one of international equity. Meanwhile local patriotism is fanned by the cheap devices of stump oratory; by the gilded trappings and fine bearing of the conventional State militia and the national army; by military exercises in public schools; by preparations for an increased navy and by skilled inventions for wholesale and speedy slaughter of people in case of war.

In case of war! Just so long as we are always providing for its possibilities, will war continue as a means of gaining an end. If peace is a principle as well as a fact, the principle applies to all cases and all war is wrong.

It is a favorite declamatory assertion that war strengthens the sinews of a nation, purifies its character and develops sturdiness and self-sacrifice. One would suppose that the whole gain was on the side of morality, whereas war impoverishes a nation morally as well as financially. But such a statement, in spite of its truth, falls noiselessly by the side of the brilliant achievements of a regiment or the personal courage of a private soldier.

This supposed national gain must be balanced against the actual individual loss. The individualistic argument has never been more powerfully set forth than in a novel by the Baroness Von Suttner, published two years ago in Germany and lately translated by Alice Abbott of Chicago under the title of "Ground Arms." The authoress is Vice President of the International Peace Congress, and at its last meeting in Rome delivered an address. She has had exceptional advantages for study of the frivolous causes and the terrible miseries of war. Those who are left at home, those who love and bear the agony of suspense, culminating in the death of the individual soldier and the glory of the nation, rebel against the so-called necessity of war. The suffering of the individual, whether it is that of a soldier or of the wife at home, gives the right to deny the justice in any war.

An army has too long been regarded as an impersonal, obedient, aggregate of individuals, none of whom has a right to the disposition of his own life. But the State itself is not an entity, it is composed of individuals who have the right to protest against the commands of a State which orders war in its own name. Such are the lines of individualistic argument in this book, which has made a profound impression in Germany.

The Baroness is right. The individual suffering entailed by war is alone a reason for its never being undertaken. Add to that the individual crime, rapine, brutality; the debased coinage and the indignity and multiplicity of pensions and no war stands justified. The horrors of one battle-field should be sufficient to forever banish war as a method in the settlement of a dispute.

No words yet have ever done justice to the brutality of war. No words, no pictures, nothing but the facts seen

can make it realized. Who can kill the most people? That is its gory essence. Each one of those killed is bound by hundreds of connecting ties to others, who, not killed, live to suffer. To die for a friend is noble, to die in saving the life of one's country is called nobler, but when posterity judges a war to have been needless, then the personal sacrifice is more keenly regretted. To save one's own country by destroying the country of some one else does not testify to the nobility of reason. Terrible suffering has been inflicted upon others under the narrow name of patriotism.

It is assumed that there is no other way than war in which to attain an end, and yet already history shows that other ways could have been devised if the leaders of a nation had been as controlled in public life as each one is expected to be in private life. When diplomacy and arbitration have their "Battle Hymns," then we shall begin to realize that any war is an insult to human intelligence and a virtual denial that God exists. Surely man knows little of divine patience.

Some of us well remember the bitter pain of the Civil War in the contumely that was called down upon the few men who stood firm to their principles, that even that war was wrong because all war is wrong. Coward and traitor were the words hurled at those few who abode by the principles, which, carefully thought out in time of peace, were strengthened by the individual suffering witnessed at home and in the army. All because both North and South were sure that each was in the right. Now the North acknowledges that the South, at least, thought it was in the right. Oh, the mockery of such acknowledgment! If the North, thirty years ago, could have believed that other ways than those of war could have been found to preserve the Union! Alas! only when the heat of politics has subsided into history is the futility of each special war recognized. The fallacy which underlies the justification of any war, falls as bitter sarcasm upon those who promoted it. Alas again! there is nothing so contagious as enthusiasm, so brilliant as military success, so hollow as national military glory!

The nation exists only as the individual exists. What is wrong as a duel is wrong as a battle. Numbers do not alter the application of right and wrong.

IS MAN A CREATURE OF PEACE?

BY J. W. VANKIRK,

Recent Graduate of Boston University Theological School.

This question cannot be fully answered by the record of human history. Upon the whole there have been more declarations of war issued for a selfish, ambitious purpose than treaties of peace agreed to for the purpose of mutual advantage. There has been more of the spirit of determination on the part of one nation, race or strong individuality to subdue another because they could, than of a turning of superior ability and advantages toward the prosperity of a less favored. Man's uncultured, misdirected, selfish nature has been more of a controlling factor in human history than that of self-sacrifice for the welfare of another. In short, man has loved himself more than he has loved his neighbor. Now it is true that man has not always regarded his neighbor's interests and that he has not always lived in harmonious relations with

him. Notwithstanding this, it may turn out that man has not yet been at his best, nor acted according to his highest privileges nor attained unto his greatest possibilities.

The peace of humanity rests upon several considerations.

First, The peace of man rests upon the possibility of his being able to think on that which is of equal interest to all. He must be able to grasp the trend of current thought. While he may not have the mental ability technically to see into the various phases of human interests, he can grasp the content of great issues. Although all men cannot lead, they must be able to follow when great interests are at stake. The great interests of humanity demand the possession of the common intelligence. Men must be able to think the same thoughts and come to the same conclusion.

One of the great gulfs between men is that of difference of opinion on the great issues of life. If men are ever to live in harmonious union they must think in harmony. This great intellectual gulf must be spanned by a common thought before nations can meet each other out on a peaceful sea to establish harmonious relations. Nations must see that international relations are the same as interstate relations, and that a peaceful sea is the only water over which a nation's interests can safely sail.

Second, In order that man may peacefully, justly and harmoniously utilize the material things of life, the same economics must constitute the basis of his industrial interests. The price of commercial products must be regulated by their value in the market rather than by the one who produces them. Labor, the actual thing done, is to be paid the same who ever does it. Every man has an inalienable right to himself and until this is recognized that part of humanity suffering the injustice may be expected to demand greater consideration.

Third, The peace of humanity depends upon a common interest and a common good. If the interests of one man or body of men, are not wrapped up in the interests of another, or if one's good is not a part of the common good there is no peace for man. For opposing interests can never become harmonized. The harmony of nations demands the same moral obligations. If the great drama of life is to be a common play, it must be acted upon the one moral stage with one moral end in view. Each nation must play its part with as high a moral reference to another as to itself and with a view to the common good. The peace of an Englishman with a Chinaman involves one moral law for both. The distinctions of race and nationality are not considerations which admit of drawing moral distinctions among men. It is true that nations and races have a peculiar function in the organic unity of humanity and form different chapters in the history of the race, but the same moral vitality and the same ethical content give life and moral direction to all.

Fourth, There is one central fact of human nature which gives a foundation for peaceful relations among men; namely, the common brotherhood of the race. This relation is not a physical but a spiritual thing. All men are not bone of the same bone and flesh of the same flesh, but they are all images of the one God, their spiritual Father. Having the same moral blood is far more significant than the same racial principle of life. We are brothers in a special creative sense. In our highest spiritual nature and in the most significant purpose of our lives